DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 309 SO 008 155

AUTHOR	Neff, Kenneth
TITLE	International Training Support in Non-Formal Education. Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education. Team Reports.
INSTITUTION	Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for International Studies in Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Agency for International Development (Dept. of State), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	42p.; For related documents, see SO 008 151 through SO 008 154
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Cross Cultural Studies; Developing Nations; Educational Alternatives; *Educational Strategies; *International Education; International Programs; *Nonformal Education; *Program Development; *Technical Assistance; Training; Transfer of Training

ABSTRACT

The study team reports from the Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education series SO 008 056 through SO 008 065 define non-formal education and search for cross-cultural applications within the research. This document in the series assumes that there are cross-cultural applications for non-formal, educational research and searches for ways and means of effecting those applications through training support programs. Six steps are identified for the design of an international training support program: (1) identification of manpower needs, (2) design of training experiences to meet the needs, (3) selection of training participants, (4) design of programs and selection of training institutions, (5) conduct of the training, and (6) use of the new trainees. A reliance upon formal documentation to communicate training needs from the field to the training institution emerges when the six step model is related to previous experience in training support for formal education. In non-formal education the lack of such communication and the existence of other characteristics which mitigate the effectiveness of the six step model result in the recommendation for a training support "network" approach. The approach stipulates early involvement of training institutions in need assessment and strategy formulation, envisages a major in-country training thrust balanced with training abroad as needed, and provides necessary network structure. (Author/JH)

ED103309

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Program of Studies in Non-formal Education

Team Reports

INTERNATIONAL TRAINING SUPPORT IN NON-FORMAL EDUCATION

By: Kenneth Neff
Professor of Education
Michigan State University

Study Team Members:

Homer Higbee
Assistant Dean,
Educational Exchange
Michigan State University

Lynn Schlueter
Research Associate
Non-Formal Education Project
Michigan State University

General Editor: Marvin Grandstaff

Institute for International Studies in Education
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

00003

These Studies were produced
with the cooperation of the
Agency for International Development
Department of State, Washington, D.C.
1974

00004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

FOREWORD. i

Designing Training for Non-Formal Education. 1

Previous International Training Support Experience 3

Program Design 5

Training Support Systems Classified According to Program Objectives 7

Training Support Systems Classified According to "Principal Change Agent" 8

Participant Training 8

Direct-support type programs 9

Contract participant programs. 12

Long-term Advisors 12

Short-term Consultants. 15

Summary 15

Training Support Linkage Networks for Non-Formal Education . . 16

International Dimensions of TRASNET. 19

Support for Need Assessment and Strategy Formulation 20

Leadership Orientation and Reconnaisance Experience(LORE) . 21

Support for Organized Review of Tactics(SORT) 21

Support for Planning, Research and Evaluation 22

Support for Program Design and Implementation 23

Basic Area Specialist Experience (BASE) 23

Program Related Educational Preparation (PREP). 24

The Host Nation Extension Learning Program (HELP) 24

Practical Applications 25

Overall Program Considerations 28

Donor Agency Administration 29

Training/Knowledge-Source Institution Contract Administration 29

In Conclusion 30

NOTES 33

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS 34

FOREWORD

The Michigan State University Program of Studies in Non-formal Education, made possible by the Agency for International Development, has two primary objectives: to build a systematic knowledge base about non-formal education, and to apply knowledge through consultation, technical assistance, workshops, and the distribution of useful materials in developing areas of the world.

This series of Team Reports is directed at the first objective, knowledge building. The series consists of the final statements of nine teams of faculty members and research fellows, each working on a separate aspect of non-formal education for a substained period of time. The reports range widely over non-formal education. They deal with its history, its categories and strategies, economics, and learning. Other reports made comparisons among country programs, survey case studies, examine the feasibility of designing non-formal education models, look at administrative alternatives and draw plans for participant training in non-formal education.

The teams were cross-disciplinary in composition, representing such areas as economics, labor and industrial relations, political science, public administration, agricultural economics, sociology and education. Together, members of the teams produced nearly one hundred working papers, many of which were shared and debated in three series of semi-weekly seminars for all project participants. The working papers, copies of which are available upon request, provide the basic ideas for the reports in this series.

In the interest of the freest possibly exploration, each team was encouraged to range widely over its domain and to develop its own set of conclusions and recommendations. Coordination was achieved through the common seminars and the exchange of data and experience. A summary volume, pulling together and synthesizing the main thrusts of all the team reports in this series, is being prepared under the editorship of Marvin Grandstaff. Like the working papers, the summary volume will be available for distribution.

00006

In line with our first objective (knowledge building) the papers in this series are conceptual in nature. In the pursuit of knowledge, however, we have tried to keep one question steadily before us: what assistance does this knowledge provide to those whose primary concern is with action--the planning and implementing of non-formal education at the level of practice? That question isn't easily answered. At best our knowledge is partial and it needs the experience dimension to make it more complete. For thought and action are not antithetical; they are necessary complements. One of our hopes is that this series of team reports may help to stimulate further dialogue between those who approach the subject of non-formal education from a conceptual point of view and those whose questions and problems arise in the exigencies of practice.

What is the role of non-formal education in future development planning? As these reports suggest, it is probably great, and will be even greater through future time. The limitations of formal schooling are coming to be better understood. As the Faure report concludes, the schools "will be less and less in a position to claim the education functions in society as its special perogative. All sectors-public administration, industry, communcations, transportation must take part in promoting education. Local and national communities are in themselves eminently education institutions".

The non-formal education component of most societies is strong, indeed frequently vigorous, and fully capable of further development and use. It is estimated that roughly half of the present educational effort in the developing countries is in the non-formal sector. Collectively, these programs exhibit characteristics indispensible to development. For example, they tend to arise in response to immediate needs; they are usually related to action and use; they tend to be short term rather than long; they have a variety of sponsors, both public and private; and they tend to be responsive to local community requirements. More importantly non-formal education shows strong

potential for getting at the human condition of those most likely to be excluded from the formal schools, the poor, the isolated, the rural, the illiterate, the unemployed and the under-employed, for being carried on in the context of limited resources, and for being efficient in terms of time and cost.

Clearly, attention given to designing new strategies for the development of this old and promising resource is worthwhile. Through this series we seek to join hands with others who are attending to the development of non-formal education.

Cole S. Brembeck, Director
Institute for International Studies
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan
1974

00008

INTERNATIONAL TRAINING SUPPORT IN NON-FORMAL EDUCATION

by

Kenneth Neff

The field of non-formal education has been described both conceptually and analytically in other reports of this series, and both strategies (Axinn) and tactics (Ward) have been suggested for implementing non-formal education programs. Attention has also been drawn to the increasing interest of nations, both donors and receivers of technical assistance, in achieving a more systematic utilization of non-formal education techniques in attacking development problems.

Given this interest, three related questions arise: (1) to what extent are non-formal education programs cross-culturally replicable, i.e., is the technology transferable? (2) if the technology is transferable, what are the training support needs of the transfer process? and, (3) can we describe the characteristics of training support programs that seem best suited to meeting identified training needs? Other reports in this series deal with the pros and cons of transferability; this report assumes transferability and searches for ways and means of effecting it through training support programs.

Designing Training for Non-Formal Education

As we consider answers to the above three questions, a fourth question emerges: Do non-formal education programs have certain characteristics that require different approaches in providing international training support? Other reports in this series suggest quite a list of factors which differentiate non-formal programs from formal ones. Our principal concern in this report is to point out those "differences" which seem to require new approaches in providing

00009

international training support: changes in the content of training programs, changes in the types of persons to be trained, changes in the training site, and changes in training methods--changes in the procedures for designing training systems. Factors like the following seem likely to require one or more of the above changes:

1. Non-formal education methods are being used in every country of the world, yet few, if any, countries have what accurately can be described as a national system of non-formal education. At best, we can describe non-formal sectors comprised of modules or program and project units, but these seem characteristically to be isolated one from another rather than linked functionally and/or administratively.
2. A considerable proportion of non-formal education activity seems to be in the private sector; though many activities receive government support.
3. Many of the persons involved in private sector non-formal education activities are volunteers who perform valuable roles for little or no financial remuneration.
4. Many non-formal programs utilize manpower in their delivery systems that is "undertrained" from an academic point of view. Many teach without the formal qualifications for teaching.
5. Non-formal programs tend to be highly task-specific; "what needs to be learned" can have a substantial impact on a program's structure, content and methods.
6. Non-formal education programs also tend to be environment- and situation-specific; non-formal education methods attempt to relate learning functionally to the environment.
7. The lack of functional and administrative structure makes the planning and coordination of national programs difficult and tends to frustrate donor agencies who like to be able to visualize institutionalized channels of delivery for their own evaluation purposes.

Consider the potential impact of the above factors on resource assessment, evaluation, the determination of training needs, the formulation of strategy, and the designing of responsive training support programs. It may prove helpful to have these and similar factors in mind as we proceed to review our previous experiences in the field of international training support.

"Participant training" was initially designated as the title of this report, but it was later abandoned because it lacked sufficient perspective. Participant training programs are but one element of training support. Historically, participant training has been used to refer to the training of program personnel outside of the host country, either in the donor country or in a cooperating third country. Unfortunately, the extensive non-formal training that has taken place as a result of consultants and technicians interacting with their host-nation counterparts has too seldom been evaluated or described as training.

"Training support" is an important concept; it refers to all training that is supported, wholly or in part, by an agent external to the system or subsystem under consideration. Grass-roots and local community programs may receive training support from regional centers which, in turn, may be supported by private or governmental agencies. Governmental agencies may provide training support to one another and these agencies may in turn receive training support from one or more foreign governments or international agencies. This concept of an interlocking chain of training support will be discussed later in greater detail. First, we should examine more closely the "international" link of the training support chain, that which historically has gone under the name of "participant training."

Previous International Training Support Experience

The non-formal education perspective is actually a new way of describing very old processes. This is also true of international training support; numerous international training support programs have been in operation for many years, though as noted earlier, not all of the activities have been viewed as essentially educational (e.g., the use of short-term consultants), and as a consequence they have not been documented and analyzed in terms of their effectiveness as training support delivery systems. This omission makes a meaningful analysis of our previous training support experience extremely

difficult. The case study literature of non-formal education projects, be they radio forums in India or the National Youth Service in Kenya, does not do much to explain or describe how persons involved in conceiving, planning, designing, evaluating, operating and/or managing such projects are prepared for their tasks. Perhaps these individuals have received training of an *ad hoc* and provisional nature which may be meeting some existing training needs but, as more emphasis is placed on non-formal education in the future, the preparatory training process should be less *ad hoc* and more deliberate--with its successes and failures carefully documented--in order that particularly effective approaches and techniques might be replicated.

Unfortunately, many of the international training support programs whose methods might provide some guidance and sense of direction have been "evaluated" using essentially "success" stories; one seldom finds sufficient attention focused on the failures or shortcomings *vis-a-vis* strategy and methods.[1] Other approaches to evaluation rely upon such quantitative measures of success as number of persons trained, total man-years of training, and funds expended.

Follow-up studies of participant satisfaction provide some useful insights (although their usefulness for designers of training support systems is limited since they tend to focus on the opinions of returned participants, and they seldom evaluate specific strategies and techniques of training). One of the most intensive follow-up studies available is the exhaustive AID-sponsored study by Gollin[2] of international participants trained in the U.S. This analysis of interviews conducted in 32 countries involving some 20,000 former participants sets forth in generalized terms the principal lessons learned from this extensive training experience. An ICA (International Cooperative Administration) study,[3] though more than 20 years old, also provides useful insights and does attempt to evaluate one country program from both the participant's and the technician's points of view. However, before attempting to proceed further with any analysis of our previous experiences with international training support, it might be helpful to present a taxonomy that facilitates analysis, particularly from the non-formal education support point of view.

Program Design

When designing an international training support program, what do we need to know about such fac ors as the location of training, the role of the training institutions in formulating training objectives and assessing training needs, and institutional constraints on the training process (by such institutions as the donor agency, the training institution, and relevant agencies in the host nation)? There are at least six identifiable steps or procedures involved in the design and implementation of international training support programs:

1. Identification of manpower needs;
2. Identification and/or designing of appropriate training experiences to meet identified manpower needs;
3. Selection and recruitment of manpower inputs (participants);
4. Selection and/or design of specific training programs and identification of training institutions and sites;
5. Conducting the training; and
6. Utilizing newly trained resources.

Evaluation is also an essential procedure, but it is not separately identified in the six-step module because it should be a continuous process involving all steps.

One variable that appears in our review of past practice is the extent of involvement of the principal institutions concerned (the donor agency, the training institution and the host-nation counterpart agency) in each of the above steps. Related to the involvement variable is the communication network--from one step of the module to another as well as from one institution to another. As will be discussed later, these communications are both explicit and implicit--both formal and informal.

Simple logic leads us to postulate that within the six-step module, the more effective the performance of each step and the better the articulation among the steps, the more effective the resulting training support program is likely to be. If, for example, manpower needs are inadequately identified, this factor will negatively impact

the process of designing or selecting training models, and the cumulative effect will be felt all down the line, though its full impact may not be felt until it is observed that newly created resources are not being effectively utilized (step #6). Similar problems can result if training needs are appropriately identified but are not adequately communicated to the training institution. Participant follow-up studies may help to identify the symptom of the problem at step six (ineffective utilization of newly trained manpower from the participant's point of view), but they seldom provide clues as to where (among the six steps) the problem lies.

Since the six-step module (perhaps we should call it SISMOD by now) must be integrated with and effectively serve a larger development planning environment, there may be communications problems with that environment. In reality, SISMOD should serve as a technological interface--internally, between implementing agencies and institutions providing training services and internationally, to link the host nation's planners and operators of programs with the technological resources of the world. One should be able to "plug" SISMOD into any educational development program--even into itself. For example, it is quite possible that the first attempt to utilize SISMOD would reveal that the host nation did not have sufficient trained manpower resources to implement the module. How then can a training support program be designed without the manpower resources needed to design it? This problem can be surmounted if there is sufficiently flexible opportunity for institutional role-playing in the execution of the module. The earlier that training needs can be identified, the earlier training/knowledge-source institutions can be involved in the modular steps. In this particular instance, at least three alternatives are possible with the cooperation of a training/knowledge-source institution:

1. Use short-term consultants in teach-by-doing roles both to assist the host nation to implement the module <u>and at the same time</u> train host nation counterparts;
2. Use short-term consultants to assist in implementing the module and develop a long-term project to institutionalize educational planning with adequate training support; or

3. Use consultant teams to assist in implementing the module with little or no attention being paid to the training roles of the consultants.

Of the three, the last has the least value from the training support point of view, though one should not rule out the possibility of "hiring" experts to perform essential, but non-repetitive tasks.

Before delving more deeply into the way things might or ought to be, let us examine some of our previous experience with international training support with reference to SISMOD. What have been the roles of the donor, host-nation, and training/knowledge-source institutions in implementing the six steps of the module and what have been the communications linkages between the steps and the institutions involved in each step?

Training Support Systems Classified According to Program Objectives

Training support programs can be classified into three broad categories in terms of the objectives of the programs they support: (1) institution-building; (2) professional and technical manpower development; and (3) awareness, or orientation.

Institution-building-related programs are those which derive their training needs from the role structures of the institutions they are attempting to build. Thus, one might call these training needs "institutionally defined." Institutions are described, tables of organization and job descriptions are conceived and persons are then trained to perform the jobs.

Training needs for category two, professional and technical manpower development, tend to be more professionally or vocationally defined. One can embark on a program for training medical doctors, for example, without particular reference to the role they will play in an institution-building sense because the development and service roles of the doctor are assumed to be well understood.

Awareness training needs in category three are responsive to "decision needs" and the programs tend to be persuasive in nature.

They consist largely of programmed experiences and demonstrations designed to make key decision-makers aware of the need for certain development-promoting decisions and to introduce them to new and useful perspectives for making such decisions. Furthermore, this category of training is of more than casual interest because it utilizes a non-formal delivery system. Both content and methods are goal-derived and the program is deemed successful when the desired behavior is performed--the needed decision is made--rather than merely when the "training" is completed.

Within a single country program one is likely to find all three types of training. In particular, category three objectives are often tied to category one and two objectives; the strengthening of professions and the building of institutions usually require that certain crucial decisions be made.

Training Support Systems Classified According to "Principal Change Agent"

Our previous experience with international training support systems has relied primarily on three types of "principal change agents": (1) participants sent abroad for training; (2) foreign technicians and consultants resident in the host nation; and (3) short-term consultants. Types two and three agents (which can be further subdivided into "contract" and "direct-hire") are usually treated as "change agents" in the literature, but the trend has been not to evaluate them in terms of their training effectiveness. Short-term consultants in particular seem to be evaluated most consistently on the basis of terminal reports that they produce. Though some such reports do stress the training role that the consultant feels he had played, the general tenor of these documents tends to stress the value of the consultant as a knowledge-source rather than as a training agent.

Participant training, the physical transportation of persons abroad for training, has been a major component of technical assistance programs through the years. The basic concept seems sound enough; the change agent role of the traveling scholar is recounted throughout the

pages of history. Since World War II, more than 160,000 participants have been sent to foreign soil for training by U.S. sources alone. Participant programs have been employed to serve all three of the earlier mentioned categories of program objectives: institution-building, professional manpower development, and orientation.

In general, there have been two types of participant training programs: those conducted as a part of a contract with one or more training/knowledge-source institutions, and those conducted in direct support of donor agency programs. There are important differences between these two types of programs from the training point of view that are particularly critical when we intend to include non-formal education programs in our spectrum. Essentially, these differences have to do with the involvement of the training institution in those steps of SISMOD prior to the implementation of training--in the assessment of manpower needs and in the identification of the training appropriate for meeting identified needs, as well as in the selection of participants. This is not to suggest that a training/knowledge-source institution should actually perform manpower assessments and select the host-nation's participants, but there are few training institutions that relish taking on the job of providing training that they would never have recommended as being suitable for the situation, nor do those institutions welcome the opportunity to try to provide such training for individuals ill-prepared to receive and utilize it. The participation, advice and counsel of such institutions should be sought early enough to contribute positively to the designing of an appropriate training support program.

Direct-support type programs characteristically have not involved training institutions in any SISMOD step prior to step #5, the conducting of the training itself. Typically, steps 1 through 4 have been conducted by the host nation, often encouraged by a donor agency technician whose advice often seems better to be explained by his own professional field of specialization than by evidence of an objective country assessment of training support needs. Thus, requests for external support for teacher training programs may

emanate from countries where donor agency technicians are teacher training specialists, whereas other countries with resident technical/vocational education advisors may "discover" that their top priority manpower training requirements lie in the field of technical and vocational education. A word of caution, however. This is not always questionable practice. Sometimes the presence of the "teacher-training" or "technical/vocational" advisor is the result of previous studies and evaluations which identified their area of specialty as a critical area of need.

Training officers have also been present in overseas missions, at least until recent times, but the policy and procedures manuals issued to assist them in the performance of their duties usually have devoted more attention to the mechanics of "moving bodies from here to there" and to matters of fiscal integrity and accountability than to procedural steps for designing effective training support programs. Again, the significance of these jobs should not be underestimated: they are essential functions in the implementation of a training support program.

The point to be stressed, then, is that the typical staffing pattern of donor agency overseas missions has not included training support systems designers. Rather, the tendency seems to have been to staff overseas missions with administrators and professional area specialists as implementors of an overall system that has relied upon "universal" concepts and an elaborate system of standardized documents as a communications network to link the various steps together. Typically, a memorandum or similar document has communicated the need for certain trained manpower components (step 1) to step 2 (the identification of and/or designing of appropriate training experiences to meet these identified needs) at which point a donor agency technician may interpret these needs in terms of his own reference points within his field of recognized competency and make recommendations to steps 3 and 4 accordingly. Two types of documents are then usually prepared--one to commit the host nation to "its side of the bargain" (in the case of AID, the ProAg and the PIO/T), and the other to communicate,

eventually to the training institution, specifics as to the training needed and to obligate funds to finance that training (for AID, the PIO/P's).

Practice among the sponsoring agencies in implementing step #4 (designing the program and selecting the training institution and site) varies considerably. Many of the multilateral agencies permit the trainee or his government to select the training institution; bilateral agency programs seem to rely more upon intermediaries to "place" the trainees in appropriate institutions. Unfortunately, the system does not require that the intermediary be professionally qualified either as a counsellor or as a specialist in the field of training proposed for the participant, nor does it require that he have any specialized knowledge of the country from which the participant emanates (and whose development goals the training support program is supposed to be furthering). Engineering-knowledgeable intermediaries are not required to place engineers, nor are the intermediaries for participants from the far eastern countries required to be orientalists in any sense of the word.[4]

Primary reliance has been upon documentary communication utilizing terminology that, hopefully, is universally understood. These communications have used terms common to the vocabulary of the "schooled" such as "degree program," "graduate level," "accountant," "technician," "nurse," and "graduate level" as descriptors for the training to be received. Given advisors, intermediaries and training specialists with similar "schooled" backgrounds, the communications process has often been surprisingly effective. The word symbols of communication used have been sufficiently understood to permit the implementation of reasonably effective training support programs for formal education areas. It has been possible for intermediaries to place and trainers to train without either knowing a great deal about the environment from which the trainee emerged and to which he was to return and attempt to apply his training. The jobs of both the intermediary and the trainer were deemed complete when the training program described in the communications documents was completed.

Yet these success criteria were not altogether sufficient; the Indonesian study[5] reports considerable dissatisfaction with the way in which (documentarily described) training programs were executed. Thus, there is evidence that there have been communications problems when relying upon "universally understood" training descriptors as links between the steps of training support programs in the formal education areas. What is likely to happen if one relies upon this communications system in implementing training programs in support of non-formal education areas where there is far less "universal understanding" (particularly among the "schooled") in terms of training descriptors?

Contract participant programs, at least in the American aid program, have operated within the same overall system as the direct support programs, but there have been some important differences where the contracts have been with the training/knowledge-source institution. It should be noted that there have been some contracts with "clearing house" type institutions to act as the intermediaries described above--the contracting agency in such cases does not perform the training function and there is little evidence to indicate that communication between field missions and the training institutions is significantly improved over direct support programs. Their chief advantage appears to have been fiscal--fewer personnel positions need to be justified in the sponsor agency's operating budget.

The most important differences between contract and direct participant programs, particularly from the non-formal education point of view, are: (1) increased possibility for the training/knowledge-source institution to participate, when needed, at an earlier point in SISMOD; and (2) the possibility of improved communications between the field and the training institution resulting in more relevant training. The word "possibility" is used advisedly--there is no evidence to support the conclusion that utilization of the contract approach guarantees improved communication.

Long-term Advisors, or resident foreign technicians and advisors constitute another element of our training support experience.

As in the case with participant training, there are differences between the training roles of direct-hire technicians on the one hand and contract technicians and advisors on the other. In the early years of the U.S. foreign aid program, direct hire technicians played a major role. Funds were then available to support large missions abroad and very little reliance was placed on contracting for long-term advisory services. However, beginning in the mid-1950's, contract advisors began to assume an increasingly important role and that trend has continued through to the present.

To the extent that the training role of both contract and direct-hire advisors is discussed in the literature, it is most often done with reference to their relations with their "counterparts." As initially conceived, the counterpart concept had considerable merit from a non-formal education training point of view--politically, it was potential "dynamite" in some environments. Stated simply, foreign technicians were supposed to relate to a host nation "counterpart" who would, by association and cooperative work-sharing through time, develop certain essential skills possessed by the technician. But the more highly placed the host nation counterpart, the less likely that either the host nation government or the aid donor would admit to having foreign national advisors actually participating in the host nation government at policy-making levels. Thus, in practice, the term counterpart has been used more often in the administrative sense to identify the host national with whom the technician or advisor has the most direct working relationship.

The principal differences between the roles of contract and direct hire technicians have been due largely to the fact that contract personnel tend to be more "single project oriented." Although there are exceptions, direct-hire personnel tend to be required to perform dual roles of advisor and donor government administrative official. In recent years, particularly, administrative duties of direct hire technicians have tended to dominate as a result of reduced foreign aid funds and resultant reductions in personnel posted in overseas missions. The often varied nature of mission programs in a single

sector coupled with the voluminous flow of paper work that inevitably accompanies each and every project produces a work load for resident direct-hire technicians that often tends to reduce their relations with their host nation counterparts to little more than an exchange of information on work in progress and plans for the future. Though contract personnel also have bureaucratic pressure on them from both their own organization and the sponsoring agency, these tend more to be project oriented. Thus, their administrative duties tend to interfere less with their counterpart relationships. In addition, from the point of view of the host government, there is less confusion of role in the case of the contract advisor--he can more consistently perform either as an "expert" in a specialized field or a representative of a training/knowledge-source institution than can a direct-hire advisor who must, in addition, play the role of officially representing the donor agency's government. This situation can be even worse in the case of multilateral agencies where resident advisors may be pressured to accept compromises between conflicting national policies of member states of the organization they represent.

Another important distinction between direct-hire and contract advisors is a result of "the reason they are present in the host country." Aid donor agencies, whether bilateral or multilateral, do not characteristically participate in a SISMOD-type exercise with the host nation in order to determine local personnel assignments. Foreign mission personnel are assigned largely in accordance with their own personnel policies, not necessarily in response to objectively determined needs for advisors with specific qualifications to perform roles mutually agreed upon by both donor and host nation governments. By way of contrast, contract personnel are assigned to the host nation according to mutually agreed upon objectives, procedures and qualifications.

Looking forward to the prospects for utilizing resident technicians and advisors as field training elements of programs designed to provide training support for non-formal education programs, experience seems to indicate that, unless there is a marked reduction

in the administrative burden on mission professional staff, there should not be heavy reliance upon direct-hire advisors to perform training functions in the field. Their administrative burdens are too many and diverse and they lack the important working linkages with training/knowledge-source institutions. The more non-formal or "unschooled" characteristics that program objectives have, the less one should rely upon field representatives having major, multi-program administrative responsibilities and who must rely primarily upon documentary communication with "schooled" personnel in "alien" institutions to achieve training objectives abroad.

Short-Term Consultants tend to perform like "contract-type" advisors whether they emanate from training/knowledge-source institutions or from government agencies. Their roles tend to be *ad hoc* and their presence in the host country is usually the result of some sort of need assessment, though the specified need more often stresses the need for knowledge rather than for training ability. Evaluated evidence as to the training effectiveness of short-term consultants is scant indeed. As noted earlier, most of the record consists of final reports which tend to stress the consultant's behavior as a knowledge-source rather than a trainer. This may result in part from selection procedures for such consultants which place great emphasis on the qualifications of the consultant as a knowledge-source rather than a promoter of learning.

Short-term consultants should be able to play a major role in non-formal education training support programs, provided they are utilized within a well-conceived, mutually planned program where they act in the tradition of agricultural extension as links with knowledge-sources and perform train-by-doing roles.

Summary

Our experience to date in providing training support for formal education programs reveals a heavy reliance upon documentary communication among the SISMOD steps. This communication system has relied upon "common knowledge" among the "schooled" to communicate training needs

from host nation agency to training/knowledge-source institutions. Though this practice has been surprisingly successful in the past, the "unschooled" terms that are likely to be used to describe programs and training needs in non-formal education training support programs probably will not be sufficiently understood by the "schooled" to permit training goals to be adequately attained.

Training Support Linkage Networks for Non-Formal Education

Training support should be rethought as a concept; it can become the very spine of a national non-formal education program. It can provide structure where none exists--it can enable national development policy to reach and constructively impact essentially independent programs at the operational level without destroying local initiative.

It is not our purpose here to attempt to summarize the other reports in this series as they have dealt with non-formal education concepts, methods and theories. However, two characteristics emerge from the earlier reports as bearing directly on the factors demanding consideration in conceptualizing the role of training support in mounting a national program of development which relies heavily upon non-formal education.[6]

1. In the schools, the learner must attempt to survive in an environment where the structure of the system, its content and its methods have been predetermined; in non-formal situations, the needs of the learner strongly influence, if not determine, content, structure and methods.
2. At the "ultimate delivery level," non-formal education programs characteristically utilize instructional personnel with little or no professional training as teachers.

Considered together, these two factors can produce a rather disquieting picture of virtually unlimited needs having to be met using extremely limited training resources.

It would appear that the overall capability of a national program must be extremely multi-faceted because of the vast range of

needs it might be called upon to serve. Stated in broad terms, the national system should be one sensitive to needs communicated from "applications" levels and capable of providing adequate training support for meeting those needs. Given the lack of the structure of a formal school system and a corps of trained instructional staff, can non-formal education approaches effectively be harnessed and supported with needed material and technological resources in order to attain national, regional and local development objectives? Needless-to-say, no government, developed or underdeveloped, has unlimited resources to devote to instructional programs, be they formal or non-formal. Therefore, any system of national support for non-formal education must have a capability of providing policy guidance and making "support/don't support" decisions. At the same time, "don't support" decisions from "policy central" should not preclude local programs being developed to meet local needs. What sort of mechanism might enable a developing country effectively to: (1) identify training needs; (2) provide training in response to those needs in accordance with national development policies; and (3) provide adequate material and technological resources to train trainers and support them in their training roles as environments, needs, policies, and training technologies evolve?

One approach that has considerable conceptual promise is that of a network of training support institutions. Functionally, the network would perform much like a multi-sector agricultural extension program coupled with an instructional resources development center of the type used on a number of American university campuses. In a given country, the specific configuration of the network would depend upon a number of factors, including: (1) the geographic distribution of work sites and training centers; (2) significant ethnic and cultural differences in the population to be served; (3) the scope of the national program both in terms of the total numbers of persons to be served by the system and the range of types of training to be supported; and (4) the availability of material, technological and human resources for use in the program.

As suggested in the introduction to this report, a training support network typically might consist of: (1) "ultimate delivery level" learning centers supported by (2) municipal, county, or other local level centers which have recourse to (3) provincial or state centers which relate in turn to (4) regional centers which receive technical support and policy guidance from (5) the central government agencies concerned which should relate to and participate in (6) some sort of national council or coordinating body where overall policies and national resource allocations are made. International training support programs, though they might support one or more operational levels in the network, would relate most properly through the coordinating body.

Staffing patterns and services performed by individual network elements should vary according to the physical, socio-economic, cultural and political environment, as should the functional linkages that connect them. However, the basic approach should be to make available professional resources specialized in the various delivery system techniques along with needed content area specialists to collaborate in meeting training support needs as they arise. The network concept is sufficiently flexible to permit adaptation to a number of national environments; countries having their population dispersed over vast territorial expanses might stress more the geographic dispersion of centers and services whereas nations with substantial ethno-linguistic problems could deal with them through emphasis on regional and/or ethnic-based centers.

One advantage of the training support network (subsequently to be referred to as TRASNET for ease of reference) is the fact that it is based upon concepts which are familiar to educators, and it provides something of an institutional or structural channel through which the transmission of developmentally relevant know-how from knowledge-source/trainer to the ultimate delivery level can be conceptualized. This can be helpful in attacking one of the elusive problems in the planning of non-formal education training support programs--that of being able to visualize the transmission of technology through

essentially non-institutional channels. As was observed in our earlier analysis of past training support programs, the formal communications channels employed to convey training needs to training institutions depended heavily upon informal communication among the "schooled" based upon their shared knowledge of the institutions of schooling and the role that they are believed to play in the transfer and dissemination of knowledge. The "schooled" educator is disturbed by the absence of familiar structure and structurally determined roles. So, too, is the potential aid donor and his staff of advisors, training officers and accountants. Yet, to "formalize" non-formal education in order to obtain a neat, orderly structure for training, planning and accounting purposes would be self-defeating.

TRASNET is proposed as something of a compromise. It provides for sufficient structuring of training support roles and the linkages among them to enable those engaged in training and funding support to visualize the system and the transmission processes. At the same time, it permits needed flexibility in the formulation of policies to meet the development needs of the individual, the community, the society, and the nation. However, its international training support component is likely to require something more than the essentially documentary system of communication used in the past.

International Dimensions of TRASNET

An international training support program for non-formal education must have a capability for dealing with a wide variety of situations. Though it is virtually impossible to conceive of a country that does not already have some non-formal training taking place, predictably, there will be substantial differences between countries ranging from those where on-going non-formal programs operate below a level of national awareness to those with substantial national programs already underway, and having a considerable fund of experience in at least some non-formal program areas.

Given the differences between "schooled" and non-formal education approaches to learning, one might expect similar differences in

the demands upon their international training support systems. Actually, one can usefully employ the same "training objective" categories as those used in the past: institution-building, professional manpower development, and awareness. The designing and building of TRASNET--its component centers and the communications network to tie them together--is certainly an institution-building endeavor. There are also professional manpower fields that require development and support (though admittedly, these should programatically be related to building TRASNET). Without a doubt, a major effort will have to be directed to orienting and making key personnel (those providing as well as receiving assistance) aware of a number of decision needs.

What, then, should this different-but-not-different training support system look like? The remainder of this report is devoted to the description of a program designed to meet the international training support needs of national non-formal education programs. It is a suggestion, not a prescription.

Support for Need Assessment and Strategy Formulation

SISMOD steps one and two are need-assessment steps: what are our specific manpower (trained behavior) needs and what are the training requirements for meeting those needs? Since such assessments will predictably produce a picture of needs in excess of capacity to meet them, this assessment activity must take place in company with the assignment of priorities. Furthermore, once needs are assessed according to priorities, an appropriate strategy must be formulated for attacking the training problems identified. Any strategy determined will have tactical implications. Some nations will require and request support for these activities. Even where support is not specifically requested, knowledge-source/training institutions will certainly benefit from participation in these processes to the extent that such involvement will enable them better to tailor subsequent training programs to needs and priorities identified and strategies adopted.

Leadership Orientation and Reconnaisance Experience (LORE) is the element of the training support program that concentrates on awareness. It should enable responsible leaders from the host nation to meet with competent professionals and jointly explore new strategic and tactical alternatives to solutions of their educational development problems. It recognizes the fact that persons playing key leadership roles in government seldom have an opportunity to break away from the pressures of their duties for periods of time sufficient to consider the alternatives open to them. In addition, LORE should enable key personnel from donor agencies and knowledge-source/training institutions to be oriented to policy and program priorities of the host government. LORE programs elements are likely to consist of short-term (5-15 day) visits. A minimum program should consist of two such visits, one by host nation leadership to one or more knowledge-source/training institutions, and the other by key personnel from potential contracting institutions to the host nation for orientation and program planning.

Support for Organized Review of Tactics (SORT) is an important program element in a well-conceived training support program. A successful SORT will depend heavily upon the completion of a national survey of organizations known to be utilizing non-formal education programs. Such a survey would attempt to describe systematically the various instructional procedures and delivery systems being employed by the various sorts of agriculture, community and rural development, family planning, health and nutrition, and manpower development programs extant and would identify their "target groups" and their training objectives. If such an assessment has not been completed, it should be conducted as a first phase of SORT.

The principal thrust of SORT is to facilitate and promote a national perspective--to develop a sense of joint responsibility among operating agencies for activities and for cooperative development of the out-of-school sector of education. Once this has been achieved, the formulation of national policies, priorities and strategies will be facilitated and a meaningful assessment of international and national

training support needs should be possible. SORT should provide consultant resources for assessment-instrument design, evaluation techniques, and program planning as needed and requested. Greater program effectiveness is likely to be achieved if at least one of the knowledge-source/training institutions involved at this step is also a participant in any resultant training support program.

Support for Planning, Research and Evaluation

Planning, Leadership and Assessment of Non-formal Systems (PLANS) is the element of the program that should train host nation personnel to play major roles in planning and/or evaluation activities dealing with education beyond the world of schooling. This training should produce personnel to staff those TRASNET centers responsible for major program planning, research and evaluation--in most countries, probably on the national level, though they may be needed also on a regional level. Such a program might provide training in the following areas:

- Non-formal educational strategies for development
- Identification of training needs
- Instructional strategies
- In-school vs. out-of-school learning, concepts compared
- Project and systems design
- Evaluation techniques
- Educational planning
- Economics of education
- Statistical methods
- Administrative problem areas
- Financing non-formal education programs
- Programming techniques.

Research required for degrees should be conducted on priority development problems of the host nation. Personnel trained in this program should be given sufficiently advanced training to enable them to reproduce themselves in their own national environments.

Support for Program Design and Implementation

Basic Area Specialist Experience (BASE) should be a major thrust in the institution-building sense--it should provide professional personnel trained in methods areas for staffing the in-country training support network. Training support centers will need to be staffed by personnel competent in project management, operation and coordination as well as media, methods and materials specialists. As broad and diverse as the field of non-formal education is, there do seem to be a number of identifiable areas of basic specialization that have sufficiently broad application to permit training at general, rather than project-specific levels. Examples of such fields of training are:

- Self-instruction delivery systems
- Mass media delivery systems
- On-the-job and in-service delivery systems
- Extension, social intervention and community development.

Within each of the above fields, trainees might study:

- Learning theory
- The learning environment
- Teaching/learning module design
- Media and materials
- Budget and finance
- Project administration
- Training support needs assessment.

Plus instruction in the general areas of:

- Non-formal educational strategies for development
- Instructional strategies
- In-school vs. out-of-school learning
- Project and systems design
- Evaluation techniques.

Trainees successfully completing such a program should be able to perform successfully in designer, managerial or operator roles in the application of their chosen delivery system and to provide

guidance and counsel as staff members of training support centers in these same role areas. In actual applications, these personnel should be teamed with specialists in technical applications areas (like nutrition, agricultural mechanics, etc.) to design and implement training programs. As in the case of PLANS trainees, these personnel should be trained to a level sufficient to enable them to replace themselves through training programs in their own countries.

Program Related Educational Preparation (PREP) is designed to provide training capability in specific applications areas rather than in general methods. When needed, this program element should provide opportunity for personnel to be trained or upgraded in specialized content areas such as family planning, home management, group dynamics and agricultural mechanics. In collaboration with their BASE-trained colleagues, PREP-trained personnel should be able to deal effectively with training needs communicated to their training support center. PREP training programs are likely to be of a short-term nature of from three weeks to six months, though there should be provision for longer periods of training when required.

The Host Nation Extension Learning Program (HELP) stresses a new way of describing short-term consultant roles with the emphasis on their training function. This program element may well be the major one in providing support for non-formal education programs because:

1. Most of the participants in non-formal programs are likely to be persons with relatively low levels of educational preparation and who do not have sufficient command of English (where English is not a national language) to engage successfully in a program of study in the United States.
2. In-country training utilizing train-by-doing roles should enhance the possibility of achieving three important objectives: (a) demonstrating the training value of work; (b) minimizing time-loss by combining training with pilot testing and evaluation; and thus (c) increasing program output during periods of training.

Language will probably be a problem in any case. To provide English language training to persons trained at comparatively low professional levels might qualify them to make more money as translators than as

non-formal educators and result in their being lost to the program. On the other hand, the use of HELP will require either considerable on-site translation capability, or the use of consultant teams having at least one member fluent in the national language. Where needed, language training should be made available for at least certain key HELP consultants.

A variety of HELP program modules could be envisaged. A number of training objectives are possible and training periods can vary in length as well as frequency. The size of HELP teams would be expected to vary in accordance with the time dimension, scope and complexity of their undertaking. HELP can be used to play valuable training and evaluation roles in support of the designing and adoption of new program areas and for supporting the establishment and early operation of training support centers. They could assist the re-entry and assumption of productive work roles for BASE and PREP participants when they return. Realization of the training value of these consultants will depend upon their being matched, virtually man-for-man, with host nation counterparts in order to build a long-term capability for the host nation to provide such services on a continuing basis.

Practical Applications

How might the training support program elements described above be "plugged in" to support a national government's development program in the non-formal education sector? Figure 1 presents in brief outline form some of the relationships between country programs and training support elements from the point of problem identification through the implementation of a program (or programs) designed to deal with the problems identified. Obviously, not all countries will be starting at the same beginning point. At the point in time that a training support program is about to be established in a given country, several of the steps in Figure 1 already may have been completed. It should also be pointed out that the steps in Figure 1 are general and could apply either to formal or non-formal educational strategy formulation. However, in this report, the application to non-formal

HOST GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS	INTERNATIONAL TRAINING SUPPORT PROGRAM ELEMENTS AND MODULES
A. Specification of Development Problem	
B. Redefinition as Educational Problems	SORT (+ HELP and PLANS)
C. National Assessments:	
1. Policy Framework	LORE
2. Existing Programs	SORT (+ HELP and PLANS)
a. objectives	
b. training resources	
c. methods	
d. technology	
e. funding	
f. benefit/cost	
3. Potential Programs	LORE, SORT (+ HELP)
a. available program models	
b. available training resources	
c. available technology	
d. available funds (and sources)	
e. expected benefit/cost	
D. Describe Feasible Models	SORT and HELP
E. Select Most Appropriate Models and Design Operational Details	SORT (+ HELP, PLANS, BASE & PREP)
F. Apply SISMOD	SORT (+ HELP, PLANS, BASE & PREP)
1. Assess Training Needs	
2. Design Training Support Program	
G. Conduct Needed Testing of Models	HELP (+ BASE & PREP)
H. Evaluate Test Results	SORT & HELP
I. Adjust Strategy as Needed	SORT
J. Implement Program(s)	HELP, BASE & PREP

Figure 1.--Relationships between international training support program elements and modules and host government operations.

education is stressed. Note also the continued reference to "modules" of the SORT and HELP elements--a modular approach seems particularly useful for organizing one's resources to provide training support for such a multi-faceted process.

Referring to Figure 1, the development problem (Step A) might be specified as "improving the quality of rural life." Before Step B can be executed, this broad problem area must be broken down functionally to permit the identification of those factors which influence the quality of rural life, such as family income, nutrition, sanitation, medical care, agricultural productivity, communications linkages, and opportunities for cultural enrichment. Having identified the contributing factors, one can then begin to specify educational outputs as they impact those factors. This enables one to execute Step B, the redefinition of the development problem as a series of educational development problems. This step requires trained planners and systems analysts. When adequate resources of this type exist, the country may only require a SORT module to assist in identifying those problems most likely to require non-formal education solutions. If planning and analyst resources are not sufficient, SORT may be supplemented by a HELP planning and evaluation module to deal with immediate training needs, plus a PLANS element to provide additional planning capability to meet the country's long-term needs.

Step C, national assessments of existing and potential programs as well as the government's national development policy framework, is a key step in developing a national program. As Figure 1 illustrates, both SORT and HELP assessment modules may be required to play major roles at this juncture. In addition, there is likely to be a need for LORE elements designed to introduce key leadership personnel to alternative programs and to orient representatives of training/knowledge-source institutions to host nation development policies and to likely project settings.

The next two steps involve the description of feasible models and the selection and adaptation of those models most appropriate to meet assessed needs. Implicit in the execution of these steps is the formulation of a non-formal education development strategy. SORT and

HELP modules can play major supportive roles at this juncture and BASE, PLANS and PREP elements may be needed to enhance the nation's capability for dealing with this problem area in the future.

Step F involves the application of SISMOD, though the manpower and training need assessment steps will probably have been done earlier for the purpose of comparing costs of alternative programs. Both SORT and HELP training-systems-design modules can provide support as needed and requested, and the training systems as designed may call for BASE, PREP, PLANS and HELP elements to meet program objectives.

The next three steps (G, H and I) are the final stages of strategy formulation. Whatever tests of models and concepts that may be required are conducted and the results evaluated. If test results so dictate, final adjustments in strategy are made. SORT and HELP evaluation modules can provide support as needed and BASE and PREP may be required to train certain pilot project personnel, though this is likely to lengthen the time required to complete the tests.

Implementation of the program(s) may or may not require continued training support. Where needed, HELP, BASE and PREP can be used to perform both short- and long-term training functions. For example, if one of the programs being implemented were to be the establishment of a training support network (TRASNET), continued international training support might be needed to extend the network beyond its initial pilot centers.

Overall Program Considerations

This report has sought to specify some of the needs for a flexible training program to support national development efforts utilizing non-formal education approaches. A training support network (TRASNET) approach has been suggested as having sufficient flexibility to permit the designing of training packages that are coordinated, country-oriented, and program- and project-specific. Program administration requirements will probably vary within each national evnrionment, in keeping with the scope of specific programs and projects undertaken. The administrative structures existing

within the country, both in terms of the host government and the local representation of the sponsoring agency, will also influence program administration. A third factor influencing administrative requirements is the type of training support activity undertaken--support for need assessment and strategy formulation may require less "continuing project administrative presence" than would a long-term TRASNET training support program.

Donor Agency Administration is of concern primarily in terms of how training/knowledge-source institutions best can relate to it. Where contract relationships are to be utilized, they might be between one or more training/knowledge-source institutions and a central office of the donor agency. (In the case of AID, this might mean a contract with the Bureau of Technical Assistance or a regional bureau.) Or, country missions might be the contracting unit.

Practically speaking, there are good reasons for having two different types of contractual agreements--one for "exploration and strategy formulation" and the other more directly geared to the implementation of a given country's non-formal education sector development programs. Exploratory contracts would use LORE and SORT elements to support need assessment and strategy formulation activities at the request of the donor agency and the host government involved. One would expect that only some of the explorations would result in follow-up development contracts. Furthermore, though it is possible that support at the exploratory stage could adequately be provided by one or two training/knoweldge-source institutions, the demand for follow-up development contracts may require the active participation of a number of institutions acting either individually or in concert as members of some sort of consortium arrangement.

Training/Knowledge-Source Institution Contract Administration will vary from contract to contract in accordance with such factors as scope (numbers of program areas and/or numbers of countries), scale (number of trainees and trainers involved), and term (length of the contractual relationship). At a given contracting institution, a single, expandable administrative structure should serve most

foreseeable needs. The principal limiting factor will be the supply of professional resources available to the training/knowledge-source institution. One institution might be able to conduct successful programs in as many as ten countries, provided no single country had an overly large number of program areas and projects, whereas three countries requiring training support for a total of thirty projects in seven different program areas could easily overtax that institution's resources.

Early contract agreements should be flexible enough to permit subsequent adjustment as all agencies and institutions involved learn from experience--experience that should be documented and studied systematically and made generally available to the community of scholars and practitioners working in non-formal education fields.

In Conclusion

"Non-formal education" and "international training support" are indeed new terms being applied to old concepts, but we are engaged in a process far more challenging than the mere application of new labels to old bottles. We are attempting to "harness the unharnessed." How can a national government direct a process that, according to some definitions, is directed by the needs of the learner and the learning environment? How can a national government effectively administer, plan, fund, and utilize non-formal education without formalizing it? Furthermore, how can donor agencies effectively support such national governments in their efforts? This report has suggested an approach to tackling the last question. We began by identifying certain factors, or characteristics, that differentiate non-formal approaches from formal approaches to performing educational functions. It was suggested that these distinguishing characteristics (briefly summarized below) might require new approaches for providing training support to non-formal education programs in developing countries:

1. Few countries, if any, have what can be described accurately as a national system of non-formal education;
2. Considerable non-formal education activity is in the private sector;
3. High usage of "volunteers" in non-formal education programs;
4. High usage of "untrained" teachers in the delivery systems;
5. Programs tend to be highly task-specific;
6. Programs also tend to be environment- and situation-specific; and
7. The lack of functional and administrative structure makes the planning and coordination of national programs difficult.

When the needs identified in this report are examined along with the distinguishing factors outlined above, certain practical operational implications for the designing and conducting of training support programs emerge:

1. *There should be less reliance upon a formal documentary system to communicate training needs from the field to the knowledge-source/training institutions.* "Schooled" training descriptors cannot be relied upon to communicate adequately the training needs of non-formal programs. The fact that such programs tend to be task-, environment-, and situation-specific makes it more difficult for training/knowledge-source institutions properly to perform their training roles unless they have been oriented to the training demands of the task and the environment. As a result--

2. *There will be a need for a greater and earlier involvement of training/knowledge-source institutions in the process of program design and planning.* The involvement of training/knowledge-source institutions in the processes of strategy formulation and training need identification which should enable them to make more effective use of their training resources. This means that--

3. *There will be a greater requirement for the actual designing of training support programs in the field.* The specific training needs of the task, environment, and situation are likely

better to be met by a "package" of training support program elements and modules that has been designed in response to those needs. The result should be an overall program with suitable elements and modules that provide the needed combination of overseas training experiences and on-site training in the host nation, the latter in recognition of the fact that--

4. *On-site, within country training is likely to play a major role in most non-formal education training support programs.* This approach will permit greater utilization of non-formal methods for the training itself, including the important function of relating training to environment. It will also permit earlier project outputs and underline an important "out-of-school" concept--the training value of work.

5. *Network concepts should be relied upon to provide needed structure.* Given the present lack of structure and coordinating linkages, networks can provide sufficient structural substance to permit strategy formulation and implementation, tactical support of priority programs, training, and program related research and evaluation. Network components should be able to make substantial contributions to our knowledge base in non-formal education and network linkages should facilitate the productive sharing of information. Furthermore, network structures should serve as channels of support and facilitate coordination without stultifying local initiative by absorbing on-going programs into a bureaucratic morass of red-tape and procedures for procedure's sake.

The training support network (TRASNET) approach suggested in this report attempts to deal responsibly with these practical considerations. It proposes the early involvement of training/knowledge-source institutions in need assessment and strategy formulation; it envisages a major in-country training thrust balanced with training abroad as needed; and it provides needed network structure.

NOTES

1. Philip Sperling, "Evaluating Training Programs: The AID Experience," in *Focus: Technical Cooperation* (supplement of International Development Review), 1973/74, p. 11.

2. See Albert E. Gollin, *Education for National Development* (New York: Praeger, 1969).

3. International Cooperation Administration, *An Evaluation of the Participant Training Program in Indonesia* (Djakarta: USOM, September, 1959).

4. Though not required, it should be noted that, in practice, aid agencies do attempt to staff according to these needs, but there are no guarantees.

5. ICA, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-28, 140.

00041

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

BASE Basic Area Specialist Experience--A training program in broad areas of basic competence described on page 23.

HELP Host nation Extension Learning Program--Describes the training roles of short-term consultants, page 24.

LORE Leadership Orientation and Reconnaisance Experience--An Awareness program for host nation and training/knowledge-source institution leadership, page 21.

PLANS Planning, Leadership and Assessment of Non-formal Systems--A training program for planners, administrators and evaluators described on page 22.

PREP Program Related Educational Preparation--A training program in specific applications areas described on page 24.

SISMOD Six Step Module--Identification of the six steps involved in the design and implementation of training support programs, page 5.

SORT Support for Organized Review of Tactics--A program providing consultant support for assessments of training needs and the formulation of strategy, page 21.

TRASNET Training Support Network--Organizational concept for supporting non-formal education projects as a part of a national program, page 16.

00042